Case 1:11-cv-00691-LAK-RWL Document 2352 Filed 10/03/19 Page 1 of 21 1

	J6AACHEOps			
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
2				
3	CHEVRON CORPORATION	,		
4	Plai	ntiff,		
5	V.		11 Civ. 691 (LAK)	
6	STEVEN DONZIGER, et	al.,		
7	Defe	ndants.	Oral Argument	
8		x		
9			New York, N.Y. June 10, 2019	
10			10:10 a.m.	
11				
12	Before:			
13		HON. LEWIS A. KAP	LAN,	
14			District Judge	
15		APPEARANCES		
16	GIDGON DUNN 6 GDUM			
17	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUT Attorneys for	for plaintiff		
18	BY: RANDY M. MASTR ANDREA NEUMAN,	ESQ.		
19	WILLIAM E. THOMSON, ESQ. ANNE MARIE CHAMPION, ESQ. HERBERT J. STERN, ESQ.			
20				
21	STEVEN R. DONZIGER Defendant Pro	Se		
22				
23	Supe	Andrew R. Romero-Delmastro, Esq. Supervising Counsel		
24	Chev	ron Corporation		
25				

1 (Case called) 2 THE CLERK: Plaintiff, are you ready? 3 MR. MASTRO: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Mastro. MR. MASTRO: Good to see you, your Honor. 5 THE CLERK: Defendant, are you ready? 6 7 MR. DONZIGER: I am. THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated. 8 9 Good morning. 10 The purpose of this hearing is to resolve any disputes 11 there may be concerning whether Mr. Donziger has purged any of the contempts for which coercive fines have been imposed. 12 13 Where do we stand as far as Chevron is concerned? 14 MR. MASTRO: Your Honor, Mr. Donziger has not complied 15 with either the contempt issues relating to paragraph 4 or paragraph 5. While there has been some measure of response on 16 17 paragraph 4 compliance, my colleague/partner Andrea Neuman will 18 address the ways in which Mr. Donziger has failed to purge 19 himself of the contempt on paragraph 4. And then, your Honor, 20 as your Honor knows, there are certain procedural issues 21 relating to paragraph 5 and Mr. Donziger's pending motion to, 22 quote/unquote, vacate. But I would be prepared to address some 23 of those questions after Ms. Neuman addresses the outstanding 24 issues on paragraph 4.

THE COURT: Well, I think the appropriate course is

25

1	probably, since Mr. Donziger claims he has at least in some		
2	respects purged himself of contempt, for him to go forward and		
3	present evidence to that effect.		
4	MR. MASTRO: Certainly, your Honor. And, again, your		
5	Honor, we're not saying that there's been no response by		
6	Mr. Donziger in connection with paragraph 4 compliance, but		
7	we're prepared to explain the ways in which we believe he has		
8	not fully complied.		
9	THE COURT: I understand.		
10	MR. MASTRO: Thank you, your Honor.		
11	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Donziger.		
12	MR. DONZIGER: May I step over to the lectern?		
13	THE COURT: Yes.		
14	MR. DONZIGER: Your Honor, just to note at the outset,		
15	I got a pretty hefty motion and affidavit from Chevron's		
16	counsel late Friday. It raises issues		
17	THE COURT: I don't believe I did.		
18	MR. DONZIGER: You didn't?		
19	THE COURT: What are you talking about?		
20	MR. DONZIGER: They filed a, I guess a statement to		
21	help you or assist you during this hearing on late Friday, with		
22	new information.		
23	THE COURT: Of course. I have that. But that's not a		
24	motion.		
25	MR. DONZIGER: I mean, whatever it is. A statement.		

That included a lot of exhibits, affidavit. The bottom line is, I'm here Monday morning. I have not even had a business day to sort of process that or do work based on that.

I'll say this about my compliance. I believe I am in compliance of your Honor's wishes with regard to contempt.

There's no dispute over the assignment. I have now executed three assignments to Chevron.

With regard to paragraph 4, I stand by my declaration, that I've sent to Chevron. I sent an original declaration. Chevron raised issues about that declaration. I then revised the declaration, sent it to Chevron as a draft, to work with Chevron to try to figure out how to get that declaration complete. And I feel very ambushed by this massive amount of information that they obviously have gathered through the subpoena process with regard to my devices I didn't know about.

THE COURT: Mr. Donziger, there is no massive amount of information. You got it several days before I did. I got it this morning.

MR. DONZIGER: I got it on Friday afternoon.

THE COURT: Yes. That's what I'm referring to. And it has three, six, nine, eleven exhibits. The first two are the two affidavits that you wrote, with which you are presumably familiar. The third is a letter to you from Chevron, or from Gibson Dunn, dated June 5th, with which you are presumably familiar. The fourth is a letter by you to

Mr. Krehel dated June 5th, with which you are presumably familiar. The fifth is something from Apple. It's a massive document of about four pages. The sixth is a couple of pages of a transcript from a deposition at which you were present on June 6th. Exhibit G is a few pages of listings from AT&T. Exhibit H are 12- and 14-year-old e-mails to and from you, which, if memory serves me, were exhibits at trial five years ago. Exhibit I seems to be a copy of your listing on some website. It's about three pages. Exhibit J is essentially the same sort of thing. And Exhibit A is a listing of the dates and times of something like eight or nine chat messages that occurred 12 years ago. This is not massive information.

OK. Let's go from there.

MR. DONZIGER: I respectfully disagree for this reason: If you look at their statements, they claim that they have records from AT&T saying I have -- there's up to 18 devices.

THE COURT: Look, Mr. Donziger, this is very simple. I am here to take evidence. You have a position on the facts. They have a position on the facts. I've read what they've said. I have the documents in front of me. I think if your position is that you have complied fully with paragraph 4, or anything else, though I understand there is no dispute about the assignments, you should get on the witness stand and give such testimony under oath as you care to give and be

cross-examined about it.

MR. DONZIGER: I'm happy to do that, once I have a chance to do due diligence based on what they filed on Friday. I mean, it's very unfair to me, sir, to call me into court on Monday morning based on this massive amount of information. They're a major law firm backed by a big oil company. I work alone out of my apartment. OK. I don't have resources to hire tech people to go investigate all the evidence they put forth. I'm happy to be as cooperative as I can. I will restate here, today, right now, that, for years, I have used two devices. And I identified those in my affidavit.

THE COURT: Mr. Donziger, I am not interested in rhetorical statements from the lectern. If you have facts to put forward, you're welcome to put them forward, under oath, now, on the witness stand.

MR. DONZIGER: I don't -- I'm not ready to do that, sir. I would ask for time to develop information. This is my question to you, and I would respectfully ask you to accommodate me.

THE COURT: Denied.

MR. DONZIGER: I'll make my record. I was going to ask you for a few days to work with Chevron to revise my declaration such that I would not be in compliance. But the real issue --

THE COURT: You asked me for that last week and I

1 denied it last week.

MR. DONZIGER: I didn't get this information, sir, until Friday.

THE COURT: Mr. Donziger, do you understand what the word "denied" means?

MR. DONZIGER: OK. So what do you want me to do at this point? I'm not prepared to put in evidence saying I have no evidence. I need to revise my declaration to make sure I know the information I can present to the Court.

THE COURT: Anything that you want to present that is within your ken you are welcome to present now, from the witness stand.

MR. DONZIGER: I just told you, I am not prepared to do that today. That's, to me, that's very unfair, sir. Can I have a few days to develop evidence and then we can -- I can put it under oath, put it in a declaration. If it's necessary to be cross-examined, I'll come back.

THE COURT: In other words, what you say from the lectern you are not prepared to say on the witness stand. Is that right?

MR. DONZIGER: That's not true. I have a draft affidavit that I sent in good faith to Chevron to work with them to get in compliance. I intend to get in compliance on paragraph 4.

THE COURT: What about paragraph 5?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DONZIGER: That's a separate issue. My position on that, as I've stated for months now, is, it implicates core constitutional rights for me and many people associated with this case. If you really look at what would happen under your protocol, which I've expressed deep problems with in the letter to Mr. Krehel, Chevron will get access to all sorts of privileged information, including my conversations with counsel, for example, from my bar proceeding, conversations with counsel in Canada who is enforcing the equitable judgment against Chevron in Canada. And I don't feel like I, as a private citizen -- obviously I'm no longer a lawyer because I've been suspended, and I'm contesting that, as you know -but as a private citizen, I retain constitutional rights. if I were to do that, it would completely moot out my ability to vindicate my constitutional rights, would essentially for all intents and purposes moot the appeal.

I'm filing something tomorrow morning, as you know — if you deny the motion to vacate, I intend to move for a stay before your Honor to block the imposition of whatever coercive fines would apply to paragraph 5. You know, I believe that I'm in compliance with paragraph 4, or can get in compliance, and I intend to. With regard to paragraph 5, I believe the Court, given the motion to vacate and given my briefing, does not have jurisdiction to impose any sort of fine on that, or any sort of

sanction on that, given there's been no contempt finding on the additional order, and my appeal was already filed prior to its issuance.

THE COURT: I know what your position is. You've repeated it any number of times. And I'll await your reply to Chevron's brief tomorrow, and I'll rule on it. I don't think you'll have to wait long, although you may surprise me.

MR. DONZIGER: Can I raise another issue?

THE COURT: What?

MR. DONZIGER: I'm concerned about a broader thing going on here, which is this. If you sort of look at the discovery that you, this Court, have authorized Chevron to engage in, which has now gone on for many months — it's implicated a lot people, including just last week my wife, my brother—in—law, bank accounts associated with my son — and you combine that with the order to turn over my devices, I believe I will no longer have any minimal space in which to conduct my affairs as an advocate or a lawyer on this case. Obviously I'm not a lawyer at this moment, but I have been up until July of last year.

And you say in your contempt findings of May 23rd that I have a right to work on the Lago Agrio case. You've always said that, back from the RICO judgment and beyond. I don't know anymore what, in your mind, is permissible for me to do or not do on this case. It's very confusing to me and I feel

1 really switched up. The judgment you imposed on me of 2 \$666,000, I felt like I was acting that entire period of time with compliance with your --3 4 THE COURT: Mr. Donziger, I'm sorry. This hearing was 5 convened for a particular purpose. It is not an opportunity 6 for you to make, all over again, every complaint you've been --7 8 What is that sound, ma'am? Is that your phone? 9 MR. ROMERO-DELMASTRO: I apologize. I didn't realize 10 my watch is --11 THE COURT: Your watch. This is not an opportunity for you to make all your 12 13 complaints all over again, for the benefit of whoever came in 14 here. We're done. You're either going to take the stand or 15 you're not going to take the stand. And whatever flows from 16 that flows from that. 17 MR. DONZIGER: OK. I just want to be clear I'm 18 willing to take the stand once I have a chance to get information that would be useful to the Court. 19 20 THE COURT: This was called for this date. You asked 21 for an adjournment previously. I am convinced, in part, what 22 is going on here is simply stalling. And I'm not going to put 23 up with it anymore.

MR. DONZIGER: Sir, respectfully, I'm not stalling. OK.

24

25

1	THE COURT: Well		
2	MR. DONZIGER: I want to mention this point because		
3	it's important.		
4	THE COURT: Well, you may want to mention it, but I'm		
5	not interested in hearing it.		
6	MR. DONZIGER: May I please speak? It will take all		
7	of 15 seconds.		
8	THE COURT: You have 15 seconds.		
9	MR. DONZIGER: All right. I really feel like this		
10	issue was ripe for decision by your Honor over a year ago when		
11	I filed my motion to dismiss their original contempt findings.		
12	They found nothing in discovery related to me selling my own		
13	shares for money. Zero, after 13 months.		
14	THE COURT: I've heard this over and over again. I'm		
15	not listening anymore.		
16	MR. DONZIGER: So to be accused of stalling, when I		
17	have asked		
18	THE COURT: Mr. Donziger		
19	MR. DONZIGER: for a decision I don't think is		
20	fair.		
21	THE COURT: Mr. Donziger, that's the way it goes. We		
22	have a court of appeals. Maybe you'll do just as well there as		
23	you hope, and maybe you won't. There we are. That's it.		
24	MR. DONZIGER: May I ask the Court a question.		
25	THE COURT: You can ask, but I don't sit here to		

1 answer questions. 2 MR. DONZIGER: As you know, there's a pending action to enforce the equitable judgment in Canada. You say in your 3 4 decision that I'm allowed to work on the Lago Agrio case. 5 your mind, does that include being able to assist counsel in 6 Canada with my pretty vast institutional knowledge about this 7 case? 8 THE COURT: I don't give advisory opinions, 9 Mr. Donziger. 10 MR. DONZIGER: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Ms. Neuman. MS. NEUMAN: Thank you, your Honor. We prepared a 12 13 small handful of slides that we thought would be helpful to the 14 Court to discuss the deficiencies. 15 THE COURT: Slides that are different from what you 16 put in, than what I received this morning? 17 MS. NEUMAN: The slides are based Ms. Champion's declaration Exhibits E and G and one additional exhibit that's 18 19 six pages that we brought with us that we found in the AT&T 20 records that was marked at Ms. Miller's deposition on Wednesday 21 as Exhibit 5969. 22 THE COURT: I don't think I need any of that. 23 Your memorandum of, I think it's June 7th --24 MS. NEUMAN: Yes, your Honor. 25

THE COURT: -- urges, in view of Mr. Donziger's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
failure to purge himself of contempt, that I should grant
additional relief, such as the surrender of any passports he
has, perhaps among other things. Do I have authority to do
that?
        MS. NEUMAN: Yes, your Honor.
        THE COURT: And where does that come from?
        MS. NEUMAN: I believe we cite the authorities in our
papers and then in our original motion for contempt, the JSC
case.
        THE COURT: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear what you just
said.
        MS. NEUMAN: I'm sorry, your Honor. The JSC case.
                    I didn't get that.
        THE COURT:
        MS. NEUMAN: JSC.
        THE COURT: JSC?
        MS. NEUMAN: Yes, your Honor.
        THE COURT: And that refers to what?
        MS. NEUMAN: JSC Foreign Economic Association Techno
Export v. International Development, 2005 WL 1983905. That
says the defendants failed to comply with the attachment order,
and Judge Koeltl granted plaintiff's request for an order
directing United States Marshals to seize certain property in
the defendant's residences. Under Cascade Capital LLC v. DRS
Processing LLC, 218 WL 4705559 at --
         THE COURT: 218 Westlaw? That doesn't sound right.
```

MS. NEUMAN: 2018. I'm sorry, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: OK. 3 MS. NEUMAN: -- Westlaw, WL, 4705559 at 4 (October 1, 4 2018), ordering as a civil contempt sanction the "U.S. Marshal 5 to secure the defendant's premises and to enable plaintiff to 6 enter the premises and recover any pertinent information 7 located therein, including digital devices on which any relevant information may be stored and for the order of seizure 8 9 of passports, Herbstein v. Bruetman, B-r-u-e-t-m-a-n, 241 F.3d 10 586-589 (7th Cir. 2001) holding that "the power to imprison a recalcitrant litigant for contempt implies the lesser power to 11 set conditions on freedom, including ordering the surrender of 12 13 one's passport." 14 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Donziger, do you want to 15 be heard about any of that? 16 I take it you have not paid any of the fines. 17 MR. DONZIGER: I wasn't certain the fines were even running. I feel like I'm in compliance. Are they running? 18 19 THE COURT: Of course they're running. 20 MR. DONZIGER: Sir, no. I don't have resources, sir, 21 to pay fines. My bank accounts are frozen by them. 22 THE COURT: Well, I have no other --23 MR. DONZIGER: Don't pretend like we're operating in a 24 world where I have a lot of resources. 25 THE COURT: Don't accuse me of pretending anything.

MR. DONZIGER: I don't have resources to pay the fines. And it really raises the larger issue, given that I don't have resources to pay the fines or the judgment, what's really going on here is there's an effort by Chevron to block me from being an advocate in terms of what's going on with enforcement of the judgment in other jurisdictions. And that violates the Second Circuit mandate. And if they're arguing my passport should be taken, which is coming sua sponte from the bench today —

THE COURT: Mr. Donziger, you well know that the statement you just made is false, because it's been requested in their papers at least once in the past.

MR. DONZIGER: I never said --

THE COURT: "Sua sponte" means on the court's own motion. That suggestion didn't come from me, and you know it.

MR. DONZIGER: I apologize. I misspoke. I didn't understand what that meant exactly. All I'm saying is it came up today when they hadn't asked for it.

THE COURT: Well, they did ask for it. They asked for it in the papers you were served.

MR. DONZIGER: In any event, the issue with the passport -- look, I can't function, not being in compliance.

OK. I've been coming here for ten years now. I've shown up for the RICO trial. I've shown up for every court hearing. I have been very clear about what I do with my time, which

includes trying to help my clients enforce their judgment consistent with the Second Circuit's mandate and your Honor's own decision. To deprive me of my ability to travel out of the country would essentially render me a nullity as an advocate, would render the Second Circuit decision a nullity in terms of my rights to be an advocate. And if you're going to do that —listen, if you do order that, you don't have to send marshals to my house. I will voluntarily surrender my passport until I can deal with it at the Second Circuit. But I just don't believe that would be an appropriate move. I believe it would be improper. I get your thinking with it. But it would essentially prevent me from carrying out what I believe I have a right to do under your Honor's own order and under the Second Circuit affirmance of the RICO judgment, my advocacy activities. So I would ask that you please not do that.

With regard to the devices, my position is clear.

After you rule on the motion to vacate, please allow me a few days to file for a stay. You know, this is not unusual in post-judgment proceedings.

THE COURT: If you want nine months to file before me for a stay, welcome to it. But the fines are running. And any other penalties I impose will be running.

MR. DONZIGER: Look, I --

THE COURT: You have the ability to get yourself out of whatever box you're in by complying with my orders. And the

United States Supreme Court says, absent a stay, you have an obligation to do that, and if you do not discharge that obligation, you do it at your own risk. And that's been clear to you for a very long time. And you disregard order after order.

MR. DONZIGER: And that would come at the stripping of my constitutional rights, sir. And that is why --

THE COURT: You have a fancy idea of your constitutional rights which this Judge has rejected in an opinion a long time ago, on grounds of waiver and on grounds of substance.

MR. DONZIGER: I understand that. But you would acknowledge that a trial judge is subject to review by an appellate court.

THE COURT: Sometimes.

MR. DONZIGER: And that's what I intend to do. And I say that respectfully.

And also I have done research on this and, granted, I don't have resources even close to the resources they do. But my research -- and I can give you a couple cases on this -- indicates that in post-judgment proceedings when the decision is already over -- there's been an appellate decision affirming your Honor's RICO judgment -- the litigant has a right to take a contempt finding up as a final appeal. It is really the only way to appeal it without being -- you know, without -- the only

way to really get review is to go into contempt, which is why, based on that law, I have asked for you to hold me in contempt for several months. You know, I didn't expect you to impose these enormous fines on me. But I really feel like the fines and judgment debtor proceeding are just another way to render me useless as an advocate.

And I think the big problem with Chevron is they're furious after all these years that the case is still going on in Canada. And I have something to do with that.

THE COURT: You're furious that they're pursuing their legal rights against you. I understand that. Both sides are furious.

MR. DONZIGER: Well, I'm not furious.

THE COURT: That's not news to me.

MR. DONZIGER: I'm not furious. I'm trying to deal with it professionally. OK. I'm trying to focus on what's important, which is, my clients are hurting and I would like them to get some sort of relief. It's way beyond me at this point, for me personally, way beyond me. And this case is not going to go away, in my opinion. It's going to continue to be enforced whether I'm involved or not. And I just think that to render me a nullity, which is what I think they're trying to do, and disable my advocacy, implicates core First Amendment rights, and to turn over those devices —

THE COURT: So you keep saying. I've heard that

record played many times before. Now, let's end it. I'm not going to listen to it anymore. You've been fully heard on it. You have briefed it. I have issued an opinion on it. You appealed from that opinion. You filed a brief in the Second Circuit. It hasn't been calendared for argument. You never sought a stay of it. There it is.

You're welcome to go on to the Second Circuit and see what happens. But you take your chances in doing so.

All right. Anything else this morning?

MR. MASTRO: No, your Honor. The only thing that I wanted to say, because I know Mr. Donziger has been responding on the paragraph 5 issue, is that it is apparent what Mr. Donziger intends to do and to argue. It's apparent that he intends not to comply with paragraph 5 regardless and to argue on the most unfounded basis that — the fact that there is a subsequent order of this Court actually deciding that issue and imposing a sanction is — he's going to try and use the same technicality or a, quote/unquote, get-out-of-jail-free card on that contempt.

There are procedures with the circuit, limited remands and the like, that could eliminate --

THE COURT: I read your brief too. I don't have to hear that all over again.

MR. MASTRO: No problem, your Honor.

And I just want to add one last thing in response to

what Mr. Donziger said. He keeps talking about his advocacy and his right to represent clients in Canada. He's been suspended from the practice of law. So things he's talking about are things that actually he's been suspended from doing here in New York.

THE COURT: Well, there are different kinds of advocacy.

Look, Mr. Donziger, just so it's entirely clear, these coercive fines that I have imposed I have made clear will evaporate if, as, and when you are in full compliance. They will be gone. I'm not sure I had to do that, but I have made that commitment. But every day that goes by — and indeed your statements here this morning suggest to me that they're a waste of time and that if these orders are to be enforced it's going to take more than I've done up to now.

Now, you would be well advised, so far as paragraph 4 is concerned, to work out your problems with Chevron and take care of at least that part of it, which you don't seem to be as upset about as the rest. And you did manage to finally comply with an order that's been outstanding for five years in respect of the assignment. We may come to a very hard place on paragraph 5 for you. But that's where we are. And I'm being totally straight with you.

MR. DONZIGER: May I just ask a very quick question about something you just said. On what basis are the fines

Case 1:11-cv-00691-LAK-RWL Document 2352 Filed 10/03/19 Page 21 of 2121

J6AACHEOps running? Under lack of compliance with paragraph 4 or under lack of compliance with paragraph 5 or both? THE COURT: Both. MR. DONZIGER: So there are simultaneous fines running in your mind? THE COURT: Simultaneous and cumulative. OK. Thank you, folks. MR. MASTRO: Thank you, your Honor. MS. NEUMAN: Thank you, your Honor. (Adjourned)